

LETTER TO U.S. DISTRICT COURT

Monday, April 11, 2022

**ATTN: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster**  
**United States District Court**  
**Middle District of North Carolina**



Re: Brian David Hill v. United States of America; no. 1:13-cr-435-1; no. 1:22-CV-00074  
Doc. #301 MOTION To Reconsider the Order/Judgment Under Document #300  
Denying Petitioner's Document #294: "Motion For Appointment of Special Master for Proceedings and Findings of Fact of Ground VII"; And Document #296: "Motion For Appointed Counsel to Assist in 2255 Case Motion and Brief/Memorandum of Law in Support of Motion by Brian David Hill." re 300 Order on Motion for Miscellaneous Relief, Order on Motion to Appoint Counsel, 296 MOTION to Appoint Attorney filed by BRIAN DAVID HILL by BRIAN DAVID HILL. Response to Motion due by 4/1/2022

CC Witness: Attorney L. Lin Wood at [lwood@linwoodlaw.com](mailto:lwood@linwoodlaw.com), through filing/service representative Roberta Hill using [rbill67@comcast.net](mailto:rbill67@comcast.net)

Dear Judge Joe Webster,

I hereby notify you that the Motion under Document #301, Motion to Reconsider; was uncontested by the Party: United States of America. **Response to Motion due by 4/1/2022**. It is now April 11, 2022, and I am sending you this letter notifying you that the contentions by Brian David Hill in Document #301 Motion to Reconsider are undisputed.

Therefore, because of the United States of America's failure to respond and did not file any counter affidavits or evidence in rebuttal within the allowed time due to Local Rule 7.3 is cause that the court should conclude that the Petitioner Brian David Hill's contentions are undisputed in Document #301.

PAGE 1 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
**TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster**

Here is a citation of Local Rule 7.3 paragraphs (f) and (k) demonstrating that Motion under #301 is uncontested and is ordinarily granted without further notice.

See the RULES OF PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE of the UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA; LR 7.3 MOTION PRACTICE

CITATION OF LR 7.3 MOTION PRACTICE; (f) Response to Motion and Brief.: The respondent, if opposing a motion, shall file a response, including brief, within 21 days after service of the motion (30 days if the motion is for summary judgment; see LR 56.1(d)) (14 days if the motion relates to discovery; see LR 26.2 and LR 37.1). If supporting documents are not then available, the respondent may move for an extension of time in accordance with section (g) of this rule. For good cause appearing therefor, a respondent may be required to file any response and supporting documents, including brief, within such shorter period of time as the Court may specify.

CITATION OF LR 7.3 MOTION PRACTICE; (k) Failure to File and Serve Motion Papers:

The failure to file a brief or response within the time specified in this rule shall constitute a waiver of the right thereafter to file such brief or response, except upon a showing of excusable neglect. A motion unaccompanied by a required brief may, in the discretion of the Court, be summarily denied. A response unaccompanied by a required brief may, in the discretion of the Court, be disregarded and the pending motion may be considered and decided as an uncontested motion. If a respondent fails to file a response within the time required by this rule, the motion will be considered and decided as an uncontested motion, and ordinarily will be granted without further notice.

The facts presented within the Document #301 Motion to Reconsider which were uncontested by the United States of America are as follows:

1. Attorney L. Lin Wood is a credible witness. Not just a credible witness but is an arbitrator for the client/client/source/sources who have

PAGE 2 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

requested the services of this attorney under attorney/client privilege in regards to the alleged blackmail scheme video files (Document #301-7, Exhibit 7) concerning “judges” and “officials” (Document #290-1, Page 5 of 16) engaged in child rape and child murder (Document #290-1, Page 4 of 16), thus is being blackmailed with the very heinous acts; such egregious acts. This should have been investigated long ago.

2. In the event that this Court cannot delay or give any more time as outlined in the Motion to Reconsider (DKT. #301, pages 50-60, paragraphs 47-63) to allow the State appellate process; or even the Governor's office in determining a 2019 Absolute Pardon Application/Petition (Absolute Pardon means legal declaration of Actual Innocence by the Governor); or a Federal Court in considering a timely filed (if filed by deadline in September of 2022) Section 2254 Motion in the Roanoke Division of the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Virginia; to declare Brian David Hill innocent of the Virginia charge of indecent exposure in September 21, 2018 at issue of Charging Documents #156, #157, and #158, and also at issue in the 2255 Motion case (#291 Motion, #292 Brief). The state process directly affects the Supervised Release Violation (#156, #157, and #158) which was

PAGE 3 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

charged in 2018 because if Brian David Hill is innocent of his charge/conviction then he did not violate his conditions of Supervised Release; did not engage in the commission of a crime as charged as alleged by the U.S. Probation Office and prosecuted by the U.S. Attorney Office representing the United States of America. Then Attorney L. Lin Wood should be allowed to electronically file a response to the United States of America in this case if the United States of America makes any defamatory, vexatious, fraudulent, or any outright false statement or statements against Attorney Lin Wood. Lin Wood has a right to respond even if he does not represent me in this case. If the Government lies about Lin Wood in this case which is defamation of character, he has the right to file an electronic response as an attorney.

3. Attorney L. Lin Wood has a right as an officer of the Court to file a response to the United States of America in this case if AUSA, Anand Prakash Ramaswamy or any other Assistant U.S. Attorney for the party: United States of America defames, attacks, makes untruthful statements about, or lies about this witness L. Lin Wood. Attorney Lin Wood has CM/ECF electronic filing capabilities as required for all attorneys in

PAGE 4 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

United States District Courts, as officers of the Court. He can and should be allowed to file via CM/ECF in this case or be allowed to sue the United States of America in a separate proceeding if this AUSA lies about Lin Wood in any way, shape, or form in their response.

4. Attorney L. Lin Wood has been in good standing with the Georgia State Bar as of the time of the EXHIBIT 2 filing of the Document #301 Motion to Reconsider: See Document #301-2; all five pages.

5. Attorney L. Lin Wood's involvement in this matter is not delusional and is not frivolous in this manner since this attorney was sent an inquiry fax from Brian David Hill in January 20, 2021 (Document #301-3, all pages, Exhibit 3) asking if certain specific judges which were involved in Brian David Hill's criminal and/or civil cases were in any of alleged blackmail scheme videos of child rape and child murder, as was alleged in Lin Wood's statements on Twitter last year. Brian's family has those tweets as they were archived on Wayback Machine and screenshots taken and printed. Lin Wood never confirmed or denied the fears of Brian David Hill. Again, Never even denied that those two suspected judges (Brian's

PAGE 5 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

suspicions) may be in at least one of the God-knows-how-many blackmail videos. So it is far from just simply dismissing those fears as delusional. His only indirect response (indirect since it was emailed to Stanley Bolten, forwarded to Roberta Hill) to Brian David Hill's fax letter didn't disprove Brian's fears but only technically claimed as a lawyer that he does not possess the actual "blackmail scheme" video files (Document #293-5, Page 2 of 4). As an attorney he does not possess the actual video files himself since there is a high risk doing such would trigger an FBI Agency armed raid or police raid on his residence or law office like with the FBI armed raid on Attorney Rudy Giuliani in New York City, but Lin Wood's source(s)/client(s) may have the blackmail video files stored encrypted on any online or cloud based file storage medium or physical storage medium somewhere where it would be easy for the Court or any officer of the Court to review over the blackmail videos as alleged. That letter in Exhibit 3 of the Motion to Reconsider (Document #301-3, all pages) specifically asked if the following individuals were in the alleged blackmail videos and this letter only will specify the Brian's suspicion of Middle District of North Carolina judges by name; suspected judges asked about in letter to

PAGE 6 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

Attorney Lin Wood: (#1) “Federal Judge William Lindsey Osteen Junior, Middle Dist. North Carolina”; and (#2) “Federal Judge Thomas David Schroeder, Middle Dist. North Carolina”. So the 2255 motion with its GROUND VII blackmail scheme fears wasn't just something asserted in that 2255 Motion and brief. Brian David Hill had asked for information last year in January on whether those specific judges involved in his case(s) (including his criminal case from 2014 to this very 2255 case (referring to Thomas David Schroeder)) were ever in one of those alleged encrypted blackmail videos. Such inquiry request is not delusional. Suspicions come when actions speak louder than words.

It is far easier and more convenient for this Court to just assume or want to assume that Brian David Hill (“Petitioner”) is delusional and rather just believe that no blackmail ever exists at all. However, the Government didn't contest or file a response to the Motion to Reconsider by April 1, 2022. The 21-day deadline due to Local rule 7.3 paragraphs (f) and (k). Just like how they never contested those fraud on the court motions in 2019 (Dkt. #222, 199, 206) asking for sanctions against the Government. Never contesting that the entire child pornography case was a fraud (Document #169). Brian Hill should have won but suspecting blackmail may be a valid reason or

PAGE 7 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

reasonable suspicion as to why he never wins in Court. The Government always seems to win here, and that right there means that the system is always fixed. That was never supposed to happen in an Article III Judiciary and Courthouses. Courthouses are not supposed to be fixed always favorable to the Government no matter what. That is a 100% successful conviction and successful cases victory rate. That is impossible unless judges are being blackmailed with something so heinous that the general public would gasp in horror if they ever found out that judges are being blackmailed.

It does happen, a few judges these days are being caught by local Sheriffs (*elected by the people unlike the Federal Marshals always loyal to the corrupt U.S. President and not loyal to the law*) with engaging in unlawful human trafficking or sex trafficking. Petitioner's family will want Petitioner to produce the text to a link of a video or article where a Honorable judge in a different state was caught in an unlawful sexual activity and was arrested. My mother saw the video and showed that video to me. I asked her to download that video and give me a copy of the video file. She finds these videos of this political corruption stuff. Law enforcement caught with child pornography, even judges or retired judges getting caught in these sting operations.

Retired Cook County judge 1 of 108 arrested during 6-day human trafficking campaign - Chicago Tribune - <https://www.chicagotribune.com/news/breaking/ct-retired-cook-county-judge-arrested-prostitution-trafficking-florida-20220317-peebrvvcwpfdazjooojfbadx4hi-story.html>

PAGE 8 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

My mother is aware of that incident as she helped get me the video for my documentary: the FEDERAL PORN WARS - Part 3: BLACKMAIL. My family is all aware of the Jeffrey Epstein blackmail scheme. Lin Wood is aware of all of that.

Anyways, today I am filing my appeal brief for appealing your decision under Document #300 to deny my Motions and label them as delusional. I have every good reason to suspect blackmail and it all goes back to the threatening email insinuating that they somehow knew Judge Osteen or will direct Judge Osteen to wrongfully convict me after the attempt to set me up with child porn back in 2015. It failed because I had contacted U.S. Probation Officer Kristy L. Burton in 2015 and told her about somebody sending me a threat text message and possibly unlawful files to the cell phone I was using which my grandmother had a paid plan for that cell phone from Tracfone (it was not what Chief Judge Schroeder labeled as a “prepaid cell phone” to make it sound like it was some kind of burner phone or something. Chief Judge Thomas David Schroeder was wrong as it was not a prepaid burner phone but had a Tracfone family plan on the cell phones including that phone voluntarily reported and turned over) and that phone was voluntarily reported to and given to Probation Officer Kristy L. Burton back in 2015, so I was never charged because I acted in good faith back in 2015, so the threatening email claim was never successfully carried out against

PAGE 9 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

me. I personally reported that printout of that threatening email, to the U.S. FBI through FAX after Attorney Susan Basko had also reported that threatening email to the U.S. FBI. My grandpa reported that threatening email to my former U.S. Probation Officer Kristy L. Burton in 2015. So we feared or at least I had feared in 2015 that they can make Judge Osteen act against me by force, threat, bribery, or blackmail. That threatening email from 2015 which Attorney Susan Basko received and the threatening text message I received gave me good reason to suspect blackmail after Attorney Lin Wood's public statements in 2021. That suspicion can be warranted or reasonably suspected if, theoretically, Judge Osteen were ever being blackmailed (Document #290-1, Page 4 of 16) with possibly the very things Attorney Lin Wood said allegedly regarding "judges" and "officials" (Document #290-1, Page 5 of 16). I hereby will cite what I am arguing in part in my appeal brief which I am mailing out today as to why it is not delusional to suspect blackmail with the existence of the threatening email reported to two FBI offices. One report by Attorney Susan Basko to the FBI, and report by Brian David Hill by FAX to the FBI in 2015.

CITATION of appeal brief being filed today with the Clerk, pages 19 through 28:

30. Appellant had made it clear that the Motion for Special Master does specify sufficient reasons for warranting a Special Master. Like one threatening email which Attorney Susan Basko had received in 2015, with nasty child pornography frame up threats, reported to the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), and it had stated or

PAGE 10 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

insinuated in their own words that they may know or can influence Judge William Lindsey Osteen Junior who was Chief Judge at the time. The threat stated or insinuated that they would make sure he was the presiding judge to wrongfully convict the Appellant after trying to set him up with child porn again to get him another child pornography charge in 2015. See the threatening email printout for yourself and see why Brian David Hill is not delusional for suspecting that former Chief Judge William Lindsey Osteen Junior and Chief Judge Thomas David Schroeder could possibly be blackmailed with child rape and murder. A threatening email regarding child pornography framing and setting up Brian David Hill again, and then Susan Basko being threatened who was also a licensed attorney, and said that they would somehow plant a particular Federal Judge to be assigned to his case to ensure that Appellant was convicted and set up with child pornography, twice.

31. Citation of threatening email under Exhibit 24 ("Exhibit 24") (Doc. #293-23) in Appellant's 2255 case supporting why Appellant suspects blackmail (citation reformatted):

"WE.....PLACED.....CHILD.....PORN.....  
.....THE.....HARD.....DRIVE.....WHICH..  
.....WAS.....GIVEN.....TO.....BRIAN.....  
.....DAVID.....HILL.....SO.....WE.....H  
AVE.....BRIAN.....ON.....POSSESSION.....A  
GAIN.....AND.....HIS.....FUCKASS.....A  
TTORNEY.....ON.....DISTRIBUTION.....BRIAN..  
.....WILL.....GO.....DOWN.....HE.....WILL.....  
....BE.....IN.....PRISON.....FOR.....LIFE.....  
...ALONG.....WITH.....HIS.....APPEAL.....  
.....ATTORNEY.....SO.....  
  
.....YOU.....HAVE.....TWO.....OPTIONS  
  
OPTION.....ONE.....YOU.....TELL.....BR  
IAN.....HE.....BETTER.....DROP.....HI  
S.....APPEAL.....OTHERWISE.....WE.....  
CALL.....THE.....FBI.....AND.....TELL....  
.....THEM.....WHAT.....CJHILD.....PORN  
.....WAS.....ON.....THE.....HARD.....

PAGE 11 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

....DRIVE.....HE.....RECEIVED.....

(Citation omitted)

REPORT.....THIS.....TO.....FBI.....AND.....  
.....WE.....WILL.....REPORT....  
.....YOU.....BRIAN.....HIS.....A  
TTORNEY.....AND.....HIS.....FAMILY.....A  
ND.....TELL.....THE.....FBI.....THEY.....L  
IKE.....TO.....MASTURBATE.....AS.....A.....  
.....FAMILY.....TO.....CHILD.....PORN.....  
.FLICKS.....WE.....HAVE.....EVIDENCE.....  
TO.....GET.....ANOTHER.....CONVICTION.....  
ON.....BRIAN.....HILL.....YOU.....CA  
NT.....PROVE.....ANYTHING.....WITH.....E  
MAILS.....WHICH.....CAN.....DISAPPEAR.....  
.....AFTER.....YOU.....READ.....EM.....OR..  
.....WE.....NOBODY.....WILL.....EVER.....BELI  
EVE.....YOU.....BITCH.....WE.....KN  
OW.....CHILD.....PORN.....GOT.....INTO.....B  
RIANS.....POSSESSION.....LAST.....WEEK..  
.....WE.....WILL.....SEND.....MORE.....  
....THEN.....HE.....WILL.....TECHNICALLY...  
.....BE.....GUILTY.....AGAIN.....JUDGE.....  
.....OSTEEN.....WILL.....CONVICT.....HIM....  
..........AGAIN.....AS.....WE.....WILL.....  
MAKE.....SURE.....OSTEEN.....IS.....P  
ROCIDING.....JUDGE.....OVER.....BRIANS.....  
.....NEW.....INDICTMENT.  
MORE.....CHILD.....PORN.....IS.....COMI  
NG.....THEN.....MORE.....CHARGES.....W  
ILL.....BE.....BROUGHT.....BITCH”

32. Again, Citation of that threatening email, says, and I am citing with a more cleaner citation without the excessive periods from the original threatening email filing so that the Court understands what Appellant had filed and why he suspects that the judges are being

PAGE 12 OF 23

Monday, April 11, 2022

TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

blackmailed here in this case: "...JUDGE OSTEEN WILL CONVICT HIM AGAIN AS WE WILL MAKE SURE OSTEEN IS PROCIDING JUDGE OVER BRIANS NEW INDICTMENT..." (citation excessive periods removed) and that was correctly cited in his 2255 Brief/Memorandum (Document #292, Pages 136 through 139) (referencing Exhibit 24 in Document # 293-23, all pages) which was also properly cited in his Motion for Special Master (Document #294, Page 7, Page 6, Page 5)(referencing Brief/Memorandum Document #292, Page 126 through 147) and Appointment of Counsel (Document #296, Page 5, Pages 15 through 19)(referencing Brief/Memorandum Document #292, Page 126 through 147). It said "we will make sure Osteen is" the presiding judge over the case. The spelling may be terrible as was the dirty language in this threatening email but the words make it clear. That threatening email sender knew exactly what happened to Brian D. Hill and said that they would make sure that a specific Chief Judge would be over Brian's case again after being framed with child pornography again as so it had claimed. This email alone from 2015 prior to the Attorney Lin Wood claims in 2021, would make it reasonable and not delusional to suspect the judges involved in his case may be affected. It is also interesting that Document #71-2, Pages 21 and 22 regarding the same threatening email of Exhibit 24 was filed on April 3, 2015. Then later on Jun 8, 2015, Judge Osteen removed himself from the case permanently recusing himself. See docket entry Jun 8, 2015: ("Case as to *BRIAN DAVID HILL Reassigned to JUDGE THOMAS D. SCHROEDER. CHIEF JUDGE WILLIAM L. OSTEEN JR. no longer assigned to the case. (Powell, Gloria) Case Reassigned*"). If he was already aware of the threatening email filed under Doc. #71-2 in addition to Appellant feeling so scared of Judge Osteen due to that threatening email that he pushed for his recusal in a written letter (Document #105, LETTER by BRIAN DAVID HILL {Entitled "Opinion on Judge Osteen"}). I am sure when Appellant had said: "...Because the Judge doesn't want me to prove my innocence..." (CITATIONS OMITTED), "...**I don't want Osteen in my case anymore. Osteen and Kristy Burton both scare me.**" that came directly out of the fears which were triggered by Document #71-2, Pages 21 and 22 regarding the same threatening email of Exhibit 24. It is clear that there is evidence Appellant was fearful of Judge Osteen after receiving a printout of that threatening

PAGE 13 OF 23

Monday, April 11, 2022

TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

email directed at both Appellant and Attorney Susan Basko. It is clear that for Judge Osteen to recuse himself meant something was wrong here and that was known in this case years prior to Appellant ever claiming of fear of blackmail scheme concerning child rape and murder as alleged by Attorney Lin Wood.

33. The district court did not have the factual evidence and factual reasoning to prove the filed evidence and references beyond reason that Appellant is just simply delusional and was only being frivolous with GROUND VII blackmail.

34. The district court erred as a matter of fact, erred as a matter of law, and erred in predetermining that Appellant was being “delusional” and “frivolous” as said in the Document #300 Order, first page. The evidence was properly cited, enough evidence was presented to justify that the Motion for a Special Master must be granted or at least considered on its merits.

35. The district court claimed: “...*The first Motion (Docket Entry 295) seeks the appointment of a special master because an attorney in Georgia stated that unidentified judges somewhere in this country are being blackmailed into raping and murdering children on video recordings...*” and that was erroneous. They were not being “blackmailed into raping and murdering children” on video recordings as the district court mistakenly said. They were being blackmailed after being ordered to rape and murder children on video recordings. Appellant never said that they were already blackmailed into the raping and murdering of children. Appellant had stated that Attorney L. Lin Wood who had once represented Donald John Trump had said that “judges” and “officials” (Doc. #290-1, Pg. 5) were being blackmailed with raping and murdering children. The district court made it sound as if the claim said they were already being blackmailed into raping and murdering children. It is a clerical mistake which have a severe consequence of a fact not being represented correctly within the record of the district court. The fact is not being represented correctly. It is an error in that sentence.

36. The district court also said “...*because an attorney in Georgia stated that unidentified judges somewhere in this country...*” to make it sound like this attorney is insignificant and may not be credible the way it sounds or was worded. That statement is erroneous as a matter

PAGE 14 OF 23

Monday, April 11, 2022

TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

of fact because it is not just “an attorney in Georgia”. This attorney has practiced in the Federal Courts in Georgia, in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eleventh Circuit over those districts, and has practiced in the U.S. Supreme Court. He has never been disbarred and never been disciplined as far as the public state bar record is concerned as far as the when the Document #300 order was entered. He is not insignificant if this Court is aware of any cases which was appealed having Attorney Lin Wood as an involved party or attorney even if under pro hac vice.

37. The district court claimed: “*...and Petitioner fears that judges in this Court, including the ones handling his case, may be affected. The Motion will be denied because Petitioner's statement is delusional and frivolous and because Petitioner's request meets none of the requirements for the appointment of a special master. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 53(a).*” Again, Appellant has every right to fear that the judges involved in handling his case/cases may be affected. It is not delusional because under Exhibit 24, as stated above, the person who sent Attorney Susan Basko a threatening email had made nasty language remarks and cuss words saying they will plant child pornography again as before and would make sure that Judge Osteen, the former Chief Judge, would be the presiding judge over his criminal case. To make sure that Brian David Hill would be indicted and convicted again of child porn back in 2015 after the plot to set him up again. The remarks make it sound like the judge will be fixed against Appellant, and that email was not originally produced by the Appellant Brian David Hill, but was originally produced as evidence from Attorney Susan Basko who had forwarded this threatening email to Brian’s mother Roberta Hill, to Brian’s appellate attorney Mark Jones ([mjones@belldavispitt.com](mailto:mjones@belldavispitt.com)), to the U.S. FBI, to Brian’s grandparents Stella and Kenneth Forinash (Ken & Stella <[kenstella2007@yahoo.com](mailto:kenstella2007@yahoo.com)>) and was forwarded to U.S. Probation Officer Kristy L. Burton ([kristy\\_burton@vawp.uscourts.gov](mailto:kristy_burton@vawp.uscourts.gov)) who was Brian’s Probation Officer at the time. So it was reported to two Federal Law Enforcement Officers/Agencies. It said that: “**WE WILL MAKE SURE OSTEEN IS PROCIDIING JUDGE**” and that statement right there is obvious. Child rape and child murder is part of the Pedophile Rings which produce child pornography, snuff films of children being murdered and abused, and the ones who sent the threatening email

PAGE 15 OF 23

Monday, April 11, 2022

TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

involving child pornography said that they will make sure Osteen is “prociding judge”. Preceding Judge referring to former Chief Judge William Lindsey Osteen Junior of the Middle District of North Carolina. Who else would they be talking about? With such a scary and heinous threatening email of that nature involving child sexual abuse itself, Brian David Hill is not delusional at the least for suspecting or even fearing that *“judges in this Court, including the ones handling his case, may be affected.”*

38. If any of the judges involved in his case may be affected by blackmail, then this converts the Federal Judges into PUPPETS, political puppets which do not act independently and do not act within the confines of the Code of Conduct for United States Judges. Every decision made by a puppet Federal Judge not acting independent or impartial is unlawful, illegal, and has no legal bearing and has no legal authority under the Constitution or under the laws of the land. Political puppets which do not act independently, do not act with impartiality, and with bias which violates what is required of judges by the U.S. Constitution for criminal cases and civil cases to be tried under an impartial trier of fact as required by 28 U.S. Code § 455 - Disqualification of justice, judge, or magistrate judge. The Code of Conduct for U.S. Judges including the ethical canons of professional conduct which apply to all federal judges of the Federal Judiciary require that all judges act independently and impartial. That they obey the same laws as that required of the citizen. So this appeal ground is an urgent issue.

39. Lin Wood is credible. Appellant made sure to show proof of the credibility of his claims by filing an additional memorandum under Document #299. See Document #299, and specifically Page 3 of 7. He said to the public:

Citation of Page 3, Dkt. #299:

“Lin Wood @LLinWood: I would never make an accusation without having reliable source for it. Stakes are too high. So I did due diligence to validate the accuracy of the shocking information I am revealing tonight. I am entirely comfortable that you are learning the truth. A truth that explains much.”

40. Why the district court would label all of the claims of this attorney

PAGE 16 OF 23

Monday, April 11, 2022

TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

as delusional and frivolous is beyond me. Just because Appellant is repeating mostly what this attorney had already claimed and the judge had labeled Appellant's claims entirely as delusional and frivolous as if Attorney Lin Wood is delusional and frivolous without ever any proof. The district court erroneously is labeling Brian David Hill, Attorney Lin Wood, and Isaac Kappy as all delusional and frivolous without ever at least attempting to figure out the credibility of Lin Wood as an officer of the Court of different federal districts. It is erroneous for the district court to batch label all evidence, Exhibits, legitimate fears, credibility of Attorney Lin Wood, and past evidence as delusional.

41. Appointment of Special Master is necessary for reviewing over the alleged blackmail videos who can devote full energies to that task, report findings in writing since the blackmail videos cannot be shown to the public without violating Federal child pornography law, and make recommendations to the court as to the findings by the Special Master. That is the case law. Ruiz v. Estelle, 503 F. Supp. 1265, 1389 (S.D. Tex. 1980) ("appointment of one or more special masters, who can devote full energies to that task, report findings, and make recommendations to the court, is imperative, if the comprehensive relief to which plaintiffs are entitled is to be achieved in an efficient and timely manner."). Ruiz v. Estelle, 503 F. Supp. 1265, 1390 (S.D. Tex. 1980) ("A review of several analyses of the execution of court-ordered remedies in institutional reform cases reveals that, for a special master to be most effective, his duties, powers, and responsibilities must be clearly delineated and understood by all the parties. To minimize misunderstandings which can hamper a special master's success, it is important that the parties contribute their respective suggestions relative to the definition of the special master's special functions."). U.S. v. Stewart, No. 02 Cr. 395 (JGK), (S.D.N.Y. Jun. 11, 2002) ("The defendant was arraigned on April 9, 2002, and, at her arraignment, requested that the Court appoint a neutral Special Master to review the materials seized from her law suite for privilege and responsiveness, rather than allowing the government to perform this review in the first instance.")

(END CITATION)

PAGE 17 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

It is clear that with the Motion to Reconsider being uncontested, the threatening email mentioning about Judge Osteen and making sure that he was the presiding judge. Attorney L. Lin Wood is not delusional. He must be allowed access to this Court's CM/ECF system as Federal Courts already require attorneys in Federal Courts to have access to this system. Lin Wood is already a federal attorney. So whatever AUSA, Anand P. Ramaswamy says in his response to Brian David Hill's § 2255 Motion under Document #291 and brief under #292; anything regarding any statement or argument or claim involving GROUNJD VII in the 2255 Motion with information alleged by "Attorney L. Lin Wood" should at least require that the witness Attorney L. Lin Wood should be allowed to file a response as well via CM/ECF. Even an affidavit if necessary.

Here again, is his information as an attorney, officer of the court with those blackmail scheme claims:

Attorney L. Lin Wood, Attorney at Law  
[lwood@linwoodlaw.com](mailto:lwood@linwoodlaw.com)  
Direct: 678-365-4116  
Fax: 404-506-9111  
[form@linwoodlaw.com](mailto:form@linwoodlaw.com)  
P.O. Box 52584  
Atlanta, GA 30355-0584

I can also ask him if he would like to file a motion or application to register pro hac vice in this case not to represent me but at least to respond to anything which Attorney Lin Wood may personally deem as defamatory or untruthful from the

PAGE 18 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

Government when they respond to the 2255 Motion as ordered in Document #300.

This letter will make sure this is known to this Court since this Court has not contacted Attorney Lin Wood to confirm or verify anything; and the federal prosecutor Ramaswamy seems like he could care less about the child rape and murder blackmail scheme, that is funny since he prosecuted me, Brian David Hill for an alleged child pornography charge but he could care less about child rape and child murder blackmail scheme. Ramaswamy is something else. He is all about himself and he is all about punishing me over and over again, wanting to hurt me and make me suffer, he doesn't care about the truth, only about his successful conviction rate and successful prosecution rate. He doesn't care about truth, he only cares about winning, Winning, Winning.

Where We Go One, We Go All. Q was right. My mother believes in Q and told me all about Q aka QAnon even when I was in jail in 2018. My mother felt like Q is real because of the corruption and lack of heart and lack of empathy in our Department of Justice aka the Department of [IN]justice. There need to be serious reforms of the FBI, and DOJ.

This Court knows and understands that Document #301 Motion to Reconsider was not contested. Contentions and facts presented in that very motion were not disputed in 21 days. The Government did not file any counter evidence or affidavits. The Motion to Reconsider should be acted upon before May 1, 2022. See Docket Entry: "Set

PAGE 19 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

Response deadline in case as to BRIAN DAVID HILL 291 MOTION to Vacate, Set Aside or Correct Sentence (pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2255). Responses due by 5/1/2022. (Bowers, Alexis)".

The Motion to Reconsider is meaningless if no action is taken on Document #301 Motion by at least May 1, 2022. The purpose of that motion is to reconsider the Order under Document #300. If it ain't going to be acted upon by May 1, then it is just another miscarriage of justice of a uncontested motion with many Exhibits of evidence treated like it doesn't exist. An excess of jurisdiction by inaction of a judge on a motion.


Brian David Hill is innocent of his probation violation. The Feds never should have rushed on September 12, 2019 to revoke supervised release. They are at FAULT, Ramaswamy is at fault for why Brian David Hill withdrawn his appeal. If it weren't for that revocation, Brian David Hill would have filed a motion to proceed pro se in State Court then started filing motions in the Circuit Court for the City of Martinsville to ask for evidence to be admitted and witnesses to be admitted. This Federal Court could not wait and instead quickly convicted the Petitioner.

Brian David Hill will file a Federal Habeas Petition for his wrongful state conviction, use the actual innocence exception, and will argue that he is under United States custody until he has fully served his supervised release by the United States Probation Office to justify that he is in custody as a direct result of the revocation

PAGE 20 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

directly caused by the state conviction due to the Federal Court interference instead of exercising judicial restraint and comity in 2019.

I have EVERY RIGHT to suspect blackmail. It is not delusional with the 2015th threatening email mentioning Judge Osteen by name, that threatening email threatening both me and Attorney Susan Basko. We both reported that to the FBI. Me through fax and her by email. Reported to my former Probation Officer. It is clear that I have every right and interference to suspect BLACKMAIL as Attorney L. Lin Wood had claimed last year. Attorney Lin Wood can discuss with his client/clients about possibly turning over the encrypted blackmail videos file/files to the Court and to the Prosecutor for examination. This can be done and the blackmail if proven would be grounds for acquittal on possibly not just the revocation but acquitting all convictions in this Court.



*Brian D. Hill*  
*Signed*

Brian D. Hill

Respectfully submitted,  
Brian D. Hill (Petitioner)

Former news reporter of U.S.W.G.O. Alternative News  
Ally of Q  
310 Forest Street, Apartment 2  
Martinsville, Virginia 24112  
(276) 790-3505



JusticeForUSWGO.NL or JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com

PAGE 21 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

## **CERTIFICATE OF FILING AND SERVICE**

I hereby certify that on this 11th day of April, 2022, I caused this Letter to The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster to be filed with the Clerk of the Court by mailing the foregoing (Certified Mail tracking no. 7021-0350-0000-9720-0066) in a prepaid Mail envelope with the Clerk of the Court then request that pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1915(d) that the Clerk of the Court move to electronically file the foregoing pleading using the CM/ECF system, which will send notice of such filing to the following registered CM/ECF users and judicial officers of the Court:

1. Anand P. Ramaswamy  
OFFICE OF THE U.S. ATTORNEY  
101 South Edgewater Street, 4th Floor  
Greensboro, North Carolina 27401 (336) 333-5351  
[Anand.Ramaswamy@usdoj.gov](mailto:Anand.Ramaswamy@usdoj.gov)

*Counsel for Appellee*

2. Angela Hewlett Miller  
U.S. Attorney Office  
101 South Edgeworth Street, 4th Floor,  
Greensboro, NC 27401 (336) 333-5351  
[angela.miller@usdoj.gov](mailto:angela.miller@usdoj.gov)

*Counsel for Appellee*

3. John M. Alsup  
U.S. Attorney Office  
101 South Edgeworth Street, 4th Floor,  
Greensboro, NC 27401 (336) 333-5351  
[john.alsup@usdoj.gov](mailto:john.alsup@usdoj.gov)

*Counsel for Appellee*

PAGE 22 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster

4. The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster  
U.S. District Court – Durham Division  
323 E. Chapel Hill Street, Room 2  
Durham, North Carolina 27701-3351  
[JWebster@ncmd.uscourts.gov](mailto:JWebster@ncmd.uscourts.gov)

*Judicial Officer letter it is directed at*

Respectfully submitted, this the 11th day of April, 2022.

Brian D. Hill  
Signed  
Brian D. Hill

Respectfully submitted,  
Brian D. Hill  
Former news reporter of U.S.W.G.O. Alternative News  
Ally of Q  
310 Forest Street, Apartment 2  
Martinsville, Virginia 24112  
(276) 790-3505



[JusticeForUSWGO.NL](http://JusticeForUSWGO.NL) or [JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com](http://JusticeForUSWGO.wordpress.com)



PAGE 23 OF 23  
Monday, April 11, 2022  
TO: The Honorable Magistrate Joe L. Webster